

Comment Resolution Log, EITC Common Transactive Services CSD06					
Includes comments on WD34 and Errata					
Commenter	Chapter	Line(s)	Comment	Action	Notes WTC
Hanno Klein, FIX	1.2	Footnote 3	SBE ballot was successful, is approved and is now almost final as ISO/IEC IS (currently PRF) 25390	Added note, updated bibliography.	
Hanno Klein, FIX	2.4	417	Typo "enumeratioin"	Accepted	
Hanno Klein, FIX	2.4	426++	Typo "liiterals" (total of 22 typos with "ii")	Accepted	New keyboard purchased by editor
Hanno Klein, FIX	2.4	428	Typo "liquiitiy"	Accepted	
Hanno Klein, FIX	3.1	464	Typo "sinigle "	Accepted	
Hanno Klein, FIX	3.1.2	488	The second example for Quantity Scale says "FIX expresses this with UnitOfMeasure equal to "kWh" and UnitOfMeasureQty equal to 1." Suggest to change "expresses" with "can express" as there is potentially more than one way of doing this. Please add tag numbers 996 and 1147 in this sentence and add them to column "FIX field" (currently says "Not in FIX", see line 637 for correct entry). I see that FIX is missing some resource units relevant for CTS, e.g. "Watt" , "kilowatt", and we should add this as part of the Gap Analysis for CTS. Please provide a list of resource units currently missing in FIXimate	Accepted in part	Resource Units pending for gap analysis. Not sure what reference to lin 637 indicates.
Hanno Klein, FIX	3.2	541	Typo "Price (44)" should not have a space after the FIX field name.	Accepted	
Hanno Klein, FIX	5.3	631+637	Typo "CfOrdId(11)" should be "CfOrdID(11)"	Accepted	
Hanno Klein, FIX	5.3	637	Typo "ExecInst (18)" should not have a space after the FIX field name.	Accepted	
Hanno Klein, FIX	5.3	637	The note for Market ID says "Note that in FIX, this is generally a formal identifier (e.g., "NYSE")". Please add ", using ISO 10383 (MIC)" to this sentence.	Accepted - three occurrences	
Hanno Klein, FIX	5.3	637	Typo "Base. may"	Accepted. Added "in this instance of Tender Base"	
Hanno Klein, FIX	5.3	637	Typo "necessariy "	Accepted	
Hanno Klein, FIX	5.3	637	Note for Segment ID says "This should be a unique combination paired with the Market Order ID". Should this be "Market ID" (not Order ID)?"	Accepted	
Hanno Klein, FIX	5.3.2	662	Suggest to change to "FIX supports multiple Execution Instructions for the same order..." to avoid ambiguity. The comparison to CTS ("while CTS restricts them to a reduced set") sounds a little odd as CTS does not limit it to a single one, just has less to choose from. Maybe make it a separate sentence, e.g. "CTS currently support only a limited set."	Changed to FIX supports multiple Execution Instructions for the same orde. CTS supports multiples from a reduced set, keeping in mind that a Segment or Market may further restrict possible Execution Instructions.	
Hanno Klein, FIX	5.3.2	669	Suggest to use "Do not reject order due to price outside of reasonable range" as note for Instruction "c".	Accepted	
Hanno Klein, FIX	5.4	686	Change "FIX List Order" to "FIX NewOrderList(35=E) message"	Accepted	
Hanno Klein, FIX	5.5	721	Typos "defined" and "information.."	Accepted	
Hanno Klein, FIX	5.6	729+740+742+744+746	Typo "CfOrderID(11)" should be "CfOrdID(11)", suggest to do a search and replace	Accepted. Note use of OrderID(37) in Table 5-6 which follows FIX semantics.	
Hanno Klein, FIX	5.6	742	Suggest to use "Party ID" and not "PartyID" in the notes as you do not mean the specific FIX field but a CTS Party, or? The former would require to show the tag number as well. Other places in the document have similar inconsistencies, suggest to look for all occurrences of "PartyID" and use "Party ID" wherever it is not explicitly the FIX field. Also applies to "CounterPartyID" vs "Counter Party ID".	Accepted. Generally what shows in the UML and code as (e.g.) PartyId is shown in text tables as Party ID. Not sure how to deal with the ambiguity. In the absence of a tag it's the CTS name? Added text to Naming conventions "Where there is a FIX tag for a particular field name the tag is shown in parentheses after the FIX field name; occasionally for readability there may be a space. One particular issue is with FIX PartyID which is one word with a tag number following; in the tables where a CTS attribute is listed as Party ID the model and generated code and profiles use the identifier PartyId with no spaces."	
Hanno Klein, FIX	5.6	742	Suggest to change the end of the note for Tender ID from "today" to "and the current business day"	Accepted.	
Hanno Klein, FIX	6.4	803	Typo "CounterpartyID" should be "Counter Party ID"	Accepted - used Counterparty ID	
Hanno Klein, FIX	7.3	895	Attribute "Positions" is a list of positions for the given Party and the resources it has and is defined as "Not in FIX". FIX does have position report messages but they convey multiple positions in a specific instrument, not for a specific party (the owning party is also part of the message). Maybe a footnote can be added to explain that. Otherwise, it looks like a big gap in FIX that there is no support for positions.	Accepted. Included text in Table 7-2 "Related to FIX PositionReport and AdjustedPositionReport messages" with a footnote with the suggested explanation.	Footnote explanation. See position message - clarify. "Position Report Message". 35=AP Multiple FIX messages.
Hanno Klein, FIX	8.3	950	Typo "information," at the end of the sentence of attribute "Response", column "Meaning"	Accepted	

Comment Resolution Log, EITC Common Transactive Services CSD06					
Includes comments on WD34 and Errata					
Commenter	Chapter	Line(s)	Comment	Action	Notes WTC
Hanno Klein, FIX	9	General	<p>Distinction between bilateral negotiations and market-facilitated negotiations not significantly clear. The workflow diagrams include the market for the latter but the former should not apply that negotiating parties need a direct network connection between them to be able to negotiate.</p> <p>Public quotes are never negotiations and public RFQs turn into bilateral negotiations with each counterparty that sends a quote. Multilateral negotiations can only occur due to a private RFQ.</p> <p>Detailed comments below are related to this general comment.</p>	Accepted. UML revised.	At CTS level network lower levels are not defined, so no implication of live connectivity only passing of payloads.. Public quotes are never subject to neg liine ?565? - Tradeable - immediately match; if indicative market asks for confirmation. To another counterparty as bilateral - public or counterparty lift? NOT THAT WAY. Credit limits or already lifted OK. (problem is "in case of public quotes") - negotiation workflow is terminated. PUBLIC QUOTES SHOULD NOT BE IN. CHAPTER 9?
Hanno Klein, FIX	9	964+1018	The statement "The Parties must inform the Segment of the agreement..." implies that an additional message must be sent for this. This should not be required. The Segment know the open requests and see when an open quote is hit/lifted and can immediately take action to confirm the trasnaction to both sides.	Re-wrote for clarity. If the agreement is made off-market, the market segment must be informed. As the market may still reject an agreement for non-market reasons ("A transaction that big would make the wires melt") a TransactionCreated message from the market confirms the Transaction	Inform segment not in Sequence Diagram. And make clear it's <market, segment>. Viiz. New diagrams - two party need 3rd party informed at the end of the flow. Two parties - send each other payloads have to register their agreement.
Hanno Klein, FIX	9	964	<p>The statement "The Market may still reject the agreement because of credit limit, or because a third Party has already lifted the quote, (in case of public quotes)..." is ambiguous. Bi. or multilateral quote negotiations and public quotes are mutually exclusive. If a quote is public, anybody can respond and try to hit the quote.</p> <p>However, negotiations can be 1:1 or 1:n (n issuers of quotes that compete against each other). A quote issuer may be too late due to another one already having satisfied the request. The Segment will then inform all other parties that the negotiation is done. Line 972 implies that negotiations are always 1:1.</p> <p>CTS currently does not specify how those parties of a multilateral negotiation are informed that are not part of the resulting transaction. It can be an EiCancelRfq as the requesting party no longer wants quotes (in this case because it has been satisfied).</p>	Accepted: UML Interactions updated and description clarified.	See previous notes. Many competing for same (public or private) quote. Private - RFQ to 5 others, get one quote per response. Tell those whose quote isn't filled (RFQ issuer being nice)? Or Timeout? 3-second example - dealer may issue another quote. Nice to have CancelRfq sent to other parties. Tradable quote issuer wants to know whether it can be hit? Up to issuer to cancel Quote and/or RFQ.
Hanno Klein, FIX	9.2	1005	Typo "rejectinig"	Accepted	
Hanno Klein, FIX	9.3	Footnote 17	Typo "bounding. Interval"	Accepted	
Hanno Klein, FIX	9.5.2	1120	<p>The note on Market RFQ ID says "In FIX the Market does not issue its own IDs when it merely supports the negotiation between the parties with its infrastructure." FIX never issues its own IDs in the context of quote negotiations. The counterparty issues quotes and creates its own IDs for them.</p> <p>What is the background for CTS requiring the market to create and maintain separate RFQ ID? That puts a burden on the quote issuer responding to RFQs. In FIX, QuoteReqID(131) is used in the response to an RFQ to refer back to the request.</p>	Accepted	"Not in Fix" - indicator - not sense to include a secondary RFQ ID. Do for orders and quotes. OK to use same pattern for FQ IDs.
Hanno Klein, FIX	9.5.3	1131	The attribute Market Quote ID is covered in FIX by SecondaryQuoteID(1751), see lines 1159 and 1171	Accepted	Correct reference in text.
Hanno Klein, FIX	9.6.1	1143+1144	Line 1143 says EiCreatedRFQ whereas line 1144 says EiCreateRFQ. Which one is it?	Could not locate.	Clarified text around publication and anonymization of quotes
Hanno Klein, FIX	12.4.2.2	1469	Replace NoMDEntries(269) with MDIncGrp	Accepted	
Hanno Klein, FIX	13.3.3	1598	Attribute Market Mechanism says "MMT is not in FIX Protocol, but is from a separate activity of FIX.". Suggest to change to "MMT codes can be mapped to the FIX Protocol." Background is that there is an official mapping between MMT and FIX Protocol.	Accepted	MMT is a FIX Trading Community specification. (14 char string, each character means something) Note - semantically in protocol fields and messages)
Hanno Klein, FIX	14.3	1691	FIXIMATE should always be referred to as FIXimate	Accepted	
Hanno Klein, FIX	F.2	2223	Please just use my short title "FIX Technical Director" instead of "co-chair of the FIX Global Technical Committee, and Senior Standards advisor at FIXdom" [thank you for mentioning me, very kind words]	Accepted	
Hanno Klein, FIX			Invalid Reference text is incomplete - expand.		

Comment Resolution Log, EITC Common Transactive Services CSD06					
Includes comments on WD34 and Errata					
Commenter	Chapter	Line(s)	Comment	Action	Notes WTC
Horia Pop, Resilient Energy			Proposed definition: The spot market is a real-time market for immediate power production and consumption. All sellers post spot tenders at any price and quantity. The market sets a spot price based on sell tenders and immediate demand.	Incorporated thinking into expanded, Updated SPOT Market definition.	
Hanno Klein, FIX	WD34	769, table 5-5	table 5-5, row "MultiLeg": Typo NewOrderMultiple->NewOrderMultileg	Accepted	
Hanno Klein, FIX	WD34	1134	typo: ditinction->distinction	Accepted	
Hanno Klein, FIX	WD34	1224	table 9-13: copy FIX field entries from line 1250, table 9-14	Accepted	
Hanno Klein, FIX	WD34	1482	table 12-3, row "SegmentStatus": Typo MarketSegStat->MarketSegmentStatus	Accepted	
David Holmberg	Errata	Table 3-3 line 523	wrong font. Table 3-4 also.	Accepted	
David Holmberg	Errata	Table 5-1	first row, "meaning" has "A Party sends a Create message containing one or more Tenders to requesting that the [Market]10 create a Tender." Not sure what this is supposed to say.	Accepted. Broke into several simpler sentences.	
David Holmberg	Errata	line 719	"A Party submitting a List with atMostOne = True is willing to accept whatever Tender 719 matches the Transaction that created by the Market." I will still debate this paragraph stating line 722. My application (simulation) has a stream tender with the amount of power I want to buy in each interval. I will take whatever I can get of that in each interval. It's not all or none. This paragraph should say that load curves are a special case of stream tender where you would set allornone. Maybe there is another place where stream tenders are discussed and where this belongs? "Stream Tenders are a special case. Stream Tenders (Load Curves) support business needs such as 722 acquiring power for a long-running industrial process. In this case, the sub-Tenders that compose a 723 Stream Tender are treated as "All or None" if the AllOrNone flag is set. See Section 5.3.2 Execution 724 Instructions."	Accepted. Paragraph re-written to more carefully distinguish between the uses of MultiLeg and AllOrNone in a Stream Tender.	
David Holmberg	Errata	Table 5-5	should start previous page. Also font changes for Multileg. Later row also (Request Publication 3 rd column). Table 5-9 third row also.	Accepted. Cleaned up start of multiple Section 5 Tables for widow/orphan control	
David Holmberg	Errata	Line 2195	"gWh" should be GWh	Accepted	